



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/400,507	09/21/1999	MARK ANTHONY CESARE	ST9-99-034	3492

24033 7590 05/21/2003

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP  
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE  
SUITE 210  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

13

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pre

**Office Action Summary**

<b>Application No.</b> 09/400,507		<b>Applicant(s)</b> CESARE ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b> Jean B Fleurant		<b>Art Unit</b> 2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,13,14,19,20 and 27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-12,15-18 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-27 are remained pending for examination.

***Response to Applicant' Remarks***

2. Applicant's arguments submitted on 02/28/2003 with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but, have been found persuasive only to the extent that the prior art of record does not specifically teach the limitations "receiving from the client a transform command indicating an input data table name in the database and at least one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command."

However, Romer teaches such limitations.

Applicant stated on page 4, that "Pirahesh does not teach or suggest all the requirements of the claims 1, 9 and 17." Although Pirahesh does not explicitly indicate all the requirements of claim 1, 9 and 17, Pirahesh clearly teaches the claimed invention, see cols. 5-6, lines 66-47.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-18 and 21-26 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirahesh et al. (US Pat. No. 5,548,758) in view of Romer et al. (US Pat. No. 5,953,534)(submitted by the Applicant "Pirahesh"), ("Romer").

As per claims 1, 9 and 17, Pirahesh teaches method for transforming data in an input table in a database in a server in communication with a client (thus, database management systems performed by computers, to the optimization of SQL queries in a relational database management system using early-out join transformations; which is readable as transforming data in an input table in a database in a server in communication with a client) (see col. 1, lines 12-15), as claimed comprises accessing a copy of the input table from the database (thus, system held statistics on the data to be accessed, the number of distinct values in a particular column; which is readable as accessing a copy of the input table from the database) (see 3, lines 21-41). But, Pirahesh does not explicitly indicate steps of receiving from the client a transform command indicating an input data table name in the database and at least one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. However, Romer indicates when the transformed

Art Unit: 2172

program runs, the program may make calls to determine the name or location of the executable or dynamically loaded library files or other facets of its environment, WINDOWS NT provides a function GetModuleFileName, which when called returns the full path name of an executable or dynamically loaded library files, from this information a program might determine the directory in which to find data files or the name of a data file, since the name and directory of the module will have changed in the transformed program, calls to GetModuleFileName must be intercepted and transformed to return the path and name of the original module instead of that of the transformed module, (see cols. 6-7, lines 63-6). Further, in column 5, lines 5-7, Romer teaches a transformed program comprises executable modules and dynamically loaded libraries that have different names than in that original program. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer with receiving from the client a transform command indicating an input data table name in the database and at least one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. This modification would allow the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer to improve the performance of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and provide new functionality (see col. 2, lines 41-44).

As per claims 2, 10 and 26, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Pirahesh further teaches a method as claimed, wherein the client is a client computer that communicates with the server over a network (see col. 1, lines 12-13).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claims 3 and 11, the limitations of claims 3 and 11 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 4, 12, 18 and 23, the limitations of claims 4, 12, 18 and 23 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 7 and 15, the limitations of claims 7 and 15 are rejected in the analysis of claim 22, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 8, 16, 21 and 25, Pirahesh teaches the claimed subject matter except the claimed wherein the transform command further comprises multiple rules, wherein each rule specifies at least one column in the input table and at least one transform operation to perform on each specified column in the input table, wherein at least two rules specify different columns in the input table and different transform operations to apply to each specified. However, Romer teaches when the transformed program runs, the program may make calls to determine the name or location of the executable or dynamically loaded library files or other facets of its environment, WINDOWS NT provides a function GetModuleFileName, which when called returns the full path name of an executable or dynamically loaded library files, from this information a program might determine the directory in which to find data files or the name of a data file, since the name and directory of the module will have changed in the transformed program, calls to GetModuleFileName must be intercepted and transformed to return the path and name of the original module instead of that of the transformed module, (see cols. 6-7, lines 63-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer with wherein each rule specifies at least one column in the input table and at least one transform operation to perform on

Art Unit: 2172

each specified column in the input table, wherein at least two rules specify different columns in the input table and different transform operations to apply to each specified. This modification would allow the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer to improve the performance of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and provide new functionality (see col. 2, lines 41-44).

As per claim 22, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Pirahesh teaches the claimed subject matter except the claimed wherein the command is transmitted from a client to a server, and wherein the server processes the command to transform data in the input table according to each rule in the transform command. However, Romer teaches when the transformed program runs, the program may make calls to determine the name or location of the executable or dynamically loaded library files or other facets of its environment, WINDOWS NT provides a function GetModuleFileName, which when called returns the full path name of an executable or dynamically loaded library files, from this information a program might determine the directory in which to find data files or the name of a data file, (see cols. 6-7, lines 63-6). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer with wherein the command is transmitted from a client to a server, and wherein the server processes the command to transform data in the input table according to each rule in the transform command. This modification would allow the teachings of Pirahesh and Romer to improve the performance of the method and system program and data structure for transforming, database, and provide new functionality (see col. 2, lines 41-44).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 24, the limitations of claim 24 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1 and 22, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 5-6, 13-14, 19-20 and 27 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The present application has been thoroughly reviewed. Upon extensive diverse databases searches, and a full review of applicant arguments, the examiner deems that the claimed features "writing the transformed input table data to the database in the server after performing all transform operations specified in the rules of the transform command against the accessing input table" in conjunction with other elements of the independent claims would not found anticipated or obvious over the prior art made of record. Therefore, claims 5-6, 13-14, 19-20 and 27 are hereby allowed. 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bramnick et al. US Patent Number 5,903,753 relates to computer operating systems.

***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Jean Bolte Fleurantin at (703) 308-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. KIM VU can be reached at (703) 305-8449. The FAX phone numbers for the



Art Unit: 2172


Group 2100 Customer Service Center are: After *Final* (703) 746-7238, *Official* (703) 746-7239, and *Non-Official* (703) 746-7240. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "DRAFT".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service Center receptionist whose telephone numbers are (703) 306-5631, (703) 306-5632, (703) 306-5633.

  
Jean Bolte Fleurantin

2003-05-11

JBFB/

  
Primary  
SHAHID AL ALAM  
PATENT EXAMINER